

I haven't talked to anybody right now—when we have got unemployment over 9 percent officially, when people are out of work and month after month can't find a job, when small business people are having trouble just keeping the lights on, I don't talk to anybody that says, "Please raise my taxes."

That's what we should be focused on are the hardworking people, the people of this country who want a job, who want to see this economy return to growth. They are the ones who understand that it's cutting taxes; it's cutting the overly burdensome regulatory system in this town that will bring back middle class jobs.

So to the gentleman's suggestion that somehow we have not been talking about jobs in this institution, I know it's not surprising to him that I disagree with that.

Mr. HOYER. It is not.

Mr. CANTOR. Right. Because I say to the gentleman, week after week we brought bills to the floor, yes, that deal with our fiscal situation—that cut spending—because we have got to address that, just like people address it in their homes, their families, their businesses.

But we brought numerous bills week after week to the floor that go to the root of the cause of uncertainty in the business community in this country, and that is Washington's overly aggressive and burdensome regulatory reach. We have got to get back to a growth posture, Mr. Speaker.

That means cut spending, lower taxes and implement a balanced and sensible pro-growth regulatory system as well as, finally, hopefully, returning to a monetary policy that promotes a strong dollar.

Mr. HOYER. First of all, of course, I didn't say anybody wants their taxes raised, including me. I would like to have all the prices for things I buy cut in half, a 50-percent-off sale. We all like that.

I like going and using my credit card—it's so much easier—and that's why credit cards encourage the economy. But you and I both know what happens when you use your credit card: At some point in time you get a bill. The people who sold you the goods or loaned you the money expect you to pay them.

I will tell my friend that I understand what he is saying. We have just come through, arguably, the worst recession that we have experienced since the Great Depression, and it was consistent with economic policies which, by the way, started, as you know, in December of 2007 and in which we lost 8 million jobs.

But the gentleman continues every time to say he wants to have policies which in 1991 and 1993 were argued were policies that were going to grow our economy, expand jobs and have those folks that you talk about do well.

Now, the gentleman misrepresents our position. I want to make it very clear: We are not for asking people who

are trying to make it in America. We are not for asking those who are struggling in America. We are not asking for those who rely on Social Security. We are not asking for those who rely on their Medicare benefits to pay the burden of the spending that we have been involved in over the last decade, which took us from \$5.6 trillion of debt to over \$10 trillion of debt.

We are not asking for those struggling Americans which the gentleman raises as the specter of those we think ought to pay their fair share. Oh, no. We are asking for those who have done extraordinarily well over the last decade, who have made millions per year in the last decade, some billions of dollars over the last decade—oil companies that are now making the biggest profits they have ever made and others—to pay a little more so that we can stabilize the finances of America.

So don't represent that it's Democrats who are asking those struggling small business people—we are not doing that—or those struggling working people in America who, by the way, have been stuck in the mud under the economic policies that were pursued consistent with the 2001 and 2003 economic programs, which have seen a growing disparity between working people and the wealthiest people in America.

Now, we can continue on that path and put on the backs of those struggling people you talk about, my friend, the responsibility to pay for things or we can have a fair and balanced program. That's what the 74 percent in the Gallup Poll want. They don't want their taxes raised.

□ 1310

What they want is a fair and balanced obligation, a fair and balanced participation in contribution to paying the debts of this country that we've incurred, and we've incurred them together. You're not all responsible. We're not all responsible.

Now, on our side of the aisle, as you well know, this deficit was increased by almost 90 percent under the Bush economic policies, far less than that under the Clinton economic policies—as a matter of fact, about half. But that's not the issue. Under both, the debt went up. We're confronted with it; we've got to pay it, and you and I believe not paying it is not an option.

The Chamber of Commerce says clearly that, first, it is critical the U.S. Government not default in any way on its fiscal obligations, and the President of the United States and our side have said, you bet, we don't want to do that. So let's ask all of us to come to the table, and those who can't afford it ought not to be asked, but those who can—those who can—should be asked to do so, not to penalize them but to say we're all in this together. Those who are the best off in America, those corporations like the oil companies that are getting subsidies at this point in time which said they didn't need

subsidies if oil was over \$55 per barrel—they testified in Congress some years ago to that fact. It has been twice that, and we're still giving them subsidies.

All we're saying is that doesn't make sense, and we ought to have a balanced program, and that's what those 74 percent and 77 percent of independents are saying. They're not saying they want their taxes raised. They're not saying we ought to raise taxes and incur more debt. They are saying we ought to pay our bills. They are saying that we ought to have a fair participation by all Americans in meeting this crisis that confronts us.

And I would hope that over the next 3 weeks that we could get to a place where we could come together in a bipartisan way and ask all of us to participate. Those who are able can help us confront this: bring this deficit down and balance our budget. For those who can't but who are working hard to make themselves and their families live a quality of life, we'll help them out. Then I think, as I said, we'll stabilize the economy; we'll grow jobs and we'll have a better country. I would hope we could do that, Mr. CANTOR, and I'm looking forward to it.

Again, I don't know that this cut, cap, and balance will get us there; but as I said, we're not going to get there, clearly, under those provisions between now and August 2. I think the gentleman knows that, and I hope he has some other thoughts in mind, some other plan in mind. Obviously, there have been a number of plans talked about. The President gave a speech about his plan. That was rejected. The gentleman says it wasn't specifically line by line. That's right, because it was rejected before we got there.

Mr. BOEHNER, your Speaker, discussed trying to get a construct. So perhaps you have a plan that is above and beyond the Cut, Cap, and Balance Act that we might see that would be a balanced plan that would help us.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 18, 2011

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MULVANEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

#### BELARUS, THE LAST DICTATORSHIP IN EUROPE

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, as we're talking about debts and deficits financially, I'm here to talk about a freedom debt and a freedom deficit that's occurring in parts around the world. One